



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,249	06/18/2001	Lainye Reich	10017175-1	3832

7590 07/25/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,249

Applicant(s)

REICH ET AL.

Examiner

Kristina B. Honeycutt

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Supplemental Amendment After Final Rejection filed on May 24, 2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 are independent claims

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on December 10, 2004 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shima (U.S. Patent 6369909; date of patent April 9, 2002; filed April 21, 2000).

Regarding independent claim 1, Shima discloses a rendering method, comprising:

- identifying an application employed to generate a digital document in a computer system (col. 10, lines 47-55 – as demonstrated in the cited text, an application generates a document);
- identifying a select rendering application from a number of rendering applications to render the document into an output file embodied in a predefined file format (col. 10, lines 56-60; col. 32, lines 50-67; col. 33, lines 1-27 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a rendering application is identified to render the document into a predefined format); and
- automatically rendering the digital document into the output file embodied in the predefined file format with the select rendering application (col. 10, lines 56-60; col. 32, lines 59-64 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the document is rendered into the predefined format).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Shima discloses the rendering method of claim 1, further comprising the step of receiving the digital document from a client device along with a rendering request (col. 26, lines 51-57).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Shima discloses the rendering method of claim 1, further comprising the step of transmitting the digital document rendered in the output file embodied in the predefined file format to a client device (col. 33, lines 17-22).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Shima discloses the rendering method of claim 1, further comprising the step automatically rendering the digital document into the output file in the predefined file format with the select rendering application further comprises rendering the digital document into a printer compatible output file embodied in a language native to a predefined printer (col. 10, lines 56-60; col. 32, lines 50-67; col. 33, lines 1-27, 35-40).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, the claims reflect the program embodied in a computer readable medium with code for performing the operations of claims 1 and 4 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 13, Shima discloses a rendering method, comprising:

- a processor circuit having a processor and a memory (col. 14, lines 51-54; col. 31, lines 62-64; col. 32, lines 16-19 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a circuit, processor and memory are disclosed);
- a rendering service executable by the processor and stored in the memory (col. 32, lines 59-64 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a rendering service is executable), the rendering service comprising;

- logic that identifies an application employed to generate a digital document in a computer system (col. 10, lines 47-55 – as demonstrated in the cited text, an application generates a document);
- logic that identifies a select rendering application from a number of rendering applications to render the document into an output file embodied in a predefined file format (col. 10, lines 56-60; col. 32, lines 50-67; col. 33, lines 1-27 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a rendering application is identified to render the document into a predefined format); and
- logic that automatically rendering the digital document into the output file embodied in the predefined file format with the select rendering application (col. 10, lines 56-60; col. 32, lines 59-64 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the document is rendered into the predefined format).

Regarding dependent claim 14, the claim reflects the rendering system for performing the operations of claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 18 and 19, the claims reflect the rendering system for performing the operations of claims 1 and 4 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima in view of Stone et al. (U.S. Patent 6101510; date of patent. August 8, 2000; filed January 29, 1997) in further view of Wenocur et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030041110; publication date February 27, 2003; filed July 25, 2001; provisional application filed February 25, 2001).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Shima does not disclose generating an instance of the select rendering application to automatically render the digital document into the output file. Stone teaches generating an instance of an application and "automatically" rendering the document (col. 3, lines 29-31; col. 8, lines 28-30; col. 23, lines 47-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shima and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system taught by Shima to include generating an instance of an application to render the document as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32), which would allow a user to render multiple documents simultaneously.

Shima does not disclose commanding the instance of the select rendering application to perform a print operation on the digital document. Stone teaches commanding the instance to perform services (col. 8, lines 28-30, 53-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shima and Stone before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system taught by Shima to include commanding an instance to perform services as taught by Stone, because Stone teaches instances performing services and an application creating and controlling multiple instances (col. 8, lines 30-32), which would allow the user to print documents in multiple instances without opening new applications for each.

Neither Shima nor Stone disclose setting a global print setting associated with the select rendering application to print to the output file. Wenocur teaches setting a global setting (p.66, para. 907). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shima, Stone and Wenocur before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system by Shima to include setting a global setting as taught by Wenocur, because Wenocur teaches global settings are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed (p.65, para. 896).

Regarding dependent claims 10, 15 and 20, the claims reflect the program and rendering systems for performing the operations of claim 5 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claims 6, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima in view of Stone in further view of Wenocur in further view of Poledna (U.S. Patent 5974346; date of patent October 26, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Shima does not disclose rewriting a global print setting associated with a number of instances of the select rendering application for printing to the output file. Poledna discloses rewriting a global setting (col. 5, lines 27-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shima and Poledna before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering system taught by Shima and global settings taught by Wenocur to include rewriting a global setting as taught by Poledna, because using global settings are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896) and allowing global settings to be rewritten, as taught by Poledna (col. 5, lines 27-30), would allow users to modify efficient settings..

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 16, the claims reflect the program and rendering system for performing the operations of claim 6 and are rejected along the same rationale.

7. Claims 7, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima in view of Stone in further view of Wenocur in further view of Poledna in

Art Unit: 2178

further view of Heeschen et al. (U.S. Patent 6380935; date of patent April 30, 2002; filed March 17, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Shima does not disclose synchronizing an initiation of the print operation of the instance of the select rendering application with a number of other initiations of print operations for other instances of the select rendering application. Heeschen discloses synchronizing initiations of operations (col. 7, lines 2-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shima and Heeschen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the rendering application taught by Shima and the global settings taught by Wenocur (p.66, para. 907) to include synchronizing initiations of operations of the instances of rendering applications as taught by Heeschen, because using global settings are more efficient in terms of code size and execution speed, as taught by Wenocur (p.65, para. 896) and rendered commands can be retrieved in the order received, as taught by Heeschen (col. 7, lines 2-9) which would allow documents to be printed in the order they were rendered and using global print settings would allow for faster printing and quicker execution.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 17, the claims reflect the program and rendering system for performing the operations of claim 7 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2178

8. Applicant's arguments filed May 24, 2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-20 under 103(a) as being anticipated by Jia (U.S. Pub. No. 20020129097) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Shima (U.S. Patent 6369909).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Event notification system tied to a file system (U.S. Patent 6549916),
- Method and apparatus for generating typed notes and links in a hypertext database from formation documents (U.S. Patent 6718329).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2178

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cesar Paula". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Cesar" and last name "Paula" clearly distinguishable.

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER